

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-9, 11, and 16-32, and 34 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 1, 9, and 11 to further clarify the invention by adding features previously set forth in these claims and claim 17 to cure a minor informality. Applicant also adds claim 35. This Amendment assumes entry of the Amendment filed on November 15, 2007.

Since claim 33 has been cancelled in the Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 filed on November 15, 2007, the rejection of this claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is rendered moot.

Claims 1-7, 9, 11, 16-32, and 34 are rejected over the prior art of record. Claim 8 contains allowable subject matter as indicated by the Examiner during the teleconference on December 4, 2007.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 9, 11, 18, 19, 24, 25, 30, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2005/0099990 to Uusikartano (hereinafter “Uusikartano”) and claims 3-6, 16, 17, 20-23, 26-29, 32, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uusikartano in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0132441 to Livet (hereinafter “Livet”). Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds of rejection at least in view of the following exemplary comments.

Of these rejected claims, only claims 1, 9, and 11 are independent. These independent claims *inter alia* and in some variation recite: “adding, by said core network entity, to said request second information, that is known at a level of said core network entity and which is

used, together with said first information, to perform a call admission control at the radio level.”

Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest adding second information known at this level of the core entity where this added information is used with the first information to perform a call admission control at the radio level.

In the Advisory Action mailed December 31, 2007, the Examiner contends that Uusikartano discloses the quality of service information that is received by the core network entity and is allegedly added/modified at the core level and is used to set up a Radio Access Bearer (*see* page 2 of the Advisory Action). However, Uusikartano only discloses quality of service information used in the RAB procedure and does not disclose and or suggest information for call admission control. In Uusikartano, the Radio Access Bearer (RAB) location procedure does not include quality of service information received by the core network entity and the added information known at the core network entity level where this information is used to perform a call admission control at the radio level.

In fact, as acknowledged by the Examiner, Uusikartano does not disclose or suggest performing a call admission control at the radio level. Information used in setting up a radio access bearer as disclosed by Uusikartano is not necessarily same information that can be used in a call admission control at the radio level. In other words, with respect to the communication between UTRAN and SGSN, Uusikartano simply discloses RAB location procedure 2-7 and 3-7 in which QoS profile is used (Figs. 2 and 3). However, this QoS profile is for RAB location procedure and there is no first and second information used in the call admission control at the radio level. In short, with respect to the communication between UTRAN and SGSN,

Uusikartano is no different from conventional techniques in that it simply discloses using QoS profile and fails to disclose adding any second information known at the SGSN level to the QoS profile and using the first and second information in a request to perform a call admission control at the radio level.

Livet does not cure the above-identified deficiencies of Uusikartano. Livet only discloses a conventional call admission control procedure (§ 23 and ¶¶ 46-48). Livet does not disclose or suggest a call admission control procedure that uses second information added at the core network entity level together with the first information. Also, in Livet, the RMM is a radio network controller (a base station) and not the core network entity (§ 10). That is, Livet only discloses the RMM monitoring the wireless communication and toggling a state based on the wireless communication load. In Livet, however, there is no request for a data session that would include the first information and add second information in the call admission control procedure. In short, Livet fails to cure the deficient teachings of Uusikartano.

For at least these exemplary reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 9, and 11 are patentable over the prior art of record. Claims 2-9, 11, 16-32, 34, and 35 are patentable by virtue of their dependency and for additional features set forth therein.

Entry and consideration are respectfully requested.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. **If any points remain in issue, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below to set up an interview.**

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)  
U.S. Application No.: 10/753,474

Attorney Docket No.: Q79100

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

/Nataliya Dvorson/  
Nataliya Dvorson  
Registration No. 56,616

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 15, 2008